

REMARKS

With the cancellation of claims 26 and 27, claims 24 and 30-42 are now pending in the above-referenced application and are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

The Examiner has objected to the specification and to the drawings. The gist of both objections is that neither the specification nor the drawings describes or show the subject matter of claim 24. Applicants traverse these objections because they do not specify which limitations recited in claim 24 lack proper antecedent basis in the specification or are absent from the drawings. After all, the specification and drawings both refer to the recited n doped layers and p-doped semiconductor layers; therefore, the objections cannot refer to these limitations. Since Applicants are not inclined to continue this process-of-elimination to discern what limitations the Examiner had in mind when making these objections, Applicants request that the Examiner either drop this issue altogether, or issue an objection that does Applicants the courtesy of identifying, with specificity, the limitations of claim 24 that he cannot find described in the specification or illustrated in the drawings.

Claims 24, 26, 27, and 30-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cline in view of Dickson and Shockley.

Shockley teaches to introduce in a P-N-P-N structure different regions within the P areas (Figure 3). In this instance, however, these regions are situated in each case only at the edges and do not extend over the entire cross section of the semiconductor as in the claimed invention. Moreover, the different P regions are not supposed to result in a special temperature behavior, but are rather supposed to produce a "guard-ring effect" (column 3, lines 40-65). That the n-doped and the p-doped semiconductor layers form two groups, which are doped at different concentrations, is not described in the cited reference according to Dickson. The succession of P-N-N-P-P-N layers described in Figure 6 does not correspond to the division of the layers into groups having different dopings used by us. Even in conjunction with the cited reference according to Cline et al., therefore, this cited reference also is unable to render the new claim obvious.

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of the present application is new, non-obvious, and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/18/08

By: B. L. Mayer (B.N. 4102)
R. 22

Richard L. Mayer
Reg. No. 22,490

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200